

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated November 23, 2005. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Initially, filed concurrently herewith, is an "Information Disclosure Statement" (IDS) and a certified copy of Japanese Patent Application No. 102202/2003. The Examiner is requested to kindly acknowledge the filing of the IDS and the certified copy of the Japanese priority document.

Next, on page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because the "air pressure sensor" recited in claim 13 is not shown. Accordingly, Fig. 3 has been amended to indicate the air pressure sensor 311a, which is housed in the valve base 311. The sensor is disclosed in paragraph [0017], which has been appropriately amended to include the new reference numeral 311a. In view of the above, it is submitted that the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) is now clearly obviated. A replacement sheet for Fig. 3 is enclosed herewith.

Further, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that Figs. 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as "Prior Art". However, as described in the specification, the wheels disclosed in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 are "related" art, and it is Applicant's belief that the structures illustrated in Figs. 1-2 do not constitute prior art with respect to the present application. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the requirement that Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 be labeled as "Prior Art".

Further, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the specification due to the use of the heading “Related Art” on page 1 of the specification. However, it is Applicant’s belief that the heading and use of the language “Related Art” is appropriate in the present case. Also, the heading corresponds to the preferred format of a U.S. specification as described in MPEP 608.01(a). Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the objection to the specification based on the use of the language “Related Art”.

Further, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the use of the term “normal rim” in paragraph [0003] of the specification and request that it be changed to --conventional-- because the limits of the term “normal” are not known. However, it is submitted that the description of a rim as a “normal rim” would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Note that this language is not intended to imply that the illustrated rims are “conventional” rims. In the wheel art, the language “normal rim” is widely accepted as a specific type of rim, which is different than a “reverse rim.”

Note that a “normal rim” is a standard or classic type of rim, in which removal of a tire is made from the outer rim side, while a reverse rim is in the shape of a “flipped” normal rim. In a “reverse” rim, tire removal is made from the inner rim side. For an example of the use of the “normal” and “reverse” rim descriptors, please see the following website: http://www.evolution.co.jp/wheels/hunk_2p/.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the language used in paragraph [0003] of the specification would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, and therefore the Examiner is requested to withdraw the objection to the language used in paragraph [0003] of the specification, as originally filed.

Further, with respect to the objection to the disclosure on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner's helpful suggestions have been adopted throughout the specification, and thus this objection is now overcome. Due to the nature of the revision involved, a substitute specification has been prepared. No new matter has been added. Further, a "marked-up" copy of the original specification is submitted to show the changes that have been incorporated into the substitute specification. The enclosed copy is entitled "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."

Finally, It is noted with appreciation that claims 1-14 are allowed over the prior art of record. Accordingly, only minor amendments to the claims have been made in order to improve the form of the original claims. In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to provide clear antecedent basis for each element recited in the claim.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Masanobu HAMADA

By: 

Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicant

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 23, 2006